

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 65, 68, 72-74, 77, 79, 80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 91, 92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 101, 103-112 were previously pending. As noted above, claims 74 and 92 have been amended, claim 95 has been canceled, and no claims have been added. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the Specification.¹ Thus, claims 65, 68, 72-74, 77, 79, 80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 91, 92, 94, 98, 99, 101 and 103-112 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application based on the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 65, 68, 80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 91 and 103-107 have been indicated as allowed. Further, claim 77 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and their intervening claims.

In response to the comment in the Official Action regarding claim 74, claim 74 has been amended to include the intervening subject matter of claim 67. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request amended claim 74 and claim 77, which depends from claim 74, be allowed as the subject matter recited in claim 74 now corresponds to the allowable intervening subject matter from claim 67.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 73, 74, 92, 95, 100 and 101 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (US Patent No. 7,254,409). Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons. Initially, claim 74 has been amended to include subject matter indicated as being allowable, and thus the rejection is moot with respect to claims 74 and claim 73, which depends from claim 74. Further, claim 100 was previously canceled and thus the rejection is moot with respect to claim 100.

Still further, claim 92 has been amended to include subject matter recited in claim 95, including “wherein the first service ID is a globally unique service ID issued by a global issuer.” The Official Action asserts the above recited subject matter is disclosed by Sato, Fig. 25 and column 28, lines 16-26. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited passage reads as follows:

¹ See, e.g., Specification, and previously presented claims 71, 76, 85, 89, 95 and 97.

First, the multicast management table used in this embodiment will now be described. In FIG. 24(a), the radio base station 110-1 on movement origin receives information concerning multicast data *distributed by radio base stations 110-2 through 110-7 adjacent to the own station* from the relevant radio base stations 110-2 through 110-7, and, informs to a radio zone Z1 at a period T₁ the multicast management table including this information and information concerning multicast data distributed by the own station. The radio terminals 120-1 through 120-3 receive this information transmitted from the radio base station 110-1 on movement origin. (Emphasis added).

Contrary to the assertions in the Official Action, the above cited text neither discloses nor suggests “wherein the first service ID is a globally unique service ID issued by a global issuer” as recited in amended claim 92. The cited passage in Sato discloses that information concerning multicast data is received from radio base stations adjacent to the own station, rather than disclosing that a first service ID is ... *issued by a global issuer*, as recited in the claimed subject matter. Further, claim 92, as amended, includes allowable subject matter corresponding to subject matter from claims 71, 76, 85 and 89, and thus is allowable for at least the same reasons. Thus, claim 92 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited reference.

Claim 101 depends from claim 92, and thus is allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the combination of subject matter recited therein.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 73, 74, 92, 95, 100 and 101 under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Sato.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 94, 98, 99 and 101 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,254,409) in view of Chang et al. (US Publication No. 2002/10102967). Claims 94, 98, 99 and 101 depend from claim 92, which is allowable over Sato, as noted above. The addition of Chang fails to cure the deficiencies of Sato. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 92, claims 94, 98, 99 and 101 are also allowable.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 94, 98, 99 and 101 under 35 USC § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of these remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 22, 2010

By: 

Darren M. Simon, Reg. No. 47,946

Direct: 858.845.2472

e-mail: dsimon@qualcomm.com

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714